



State of Utah

DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES
DIVISION OF OIL, GAS AND MINING

Norman H. Bangerter
Governor

Dee C. Hansen
Executive Director

Dianne R. Nielson, Ph.D.
Division Director

355 West North Temple
3 Triad Center, Suite 350
Salt Lake City, Utah 84180-1203
801-538-5340

December 19, 1991

TO: Minerals File

FROM: D. Wayne Hedberg, Permit Supervisor *JH for DWH*

RE: Site Inspection, North Lily Mining Company, Tintic Project Mine,
M/023/007, Juab County, Utah

Date of Inspection: December 18, 1991

Time of Inspection: 10:30 AM

Conditions: Cloudy, cold, snowy

Participants: D. Wayne Hedberg, Holland Shepherd and Tony Gallegos -
Division of Oil, Gas & Mining; Paul Spor - North Lily Mining
Company

The purpose of this inspection was to observe the mine waste dump locations proposed by North Lily Mining Company to be reprocessed as part of a new permit amendment. We also inspected some other reclaimed disturbed areas that the operator hopes to "exchange" for the new disturbances associated with reprocessing the dumps. We met Mr. Paul Spor, General Manager, at the mine office and proceeded from there to inspect each of the waste dumps proposed to be reprocessed.

The following waste dumps were inspected in sequential order: Upper Mammoth, North Star, EONS (East of North Star), Iron Blossom #3, Colorado #1 and #2, Eagle and Eureka Hill. Each dump will be screened to remove the fines from the coarse material. The fines will be removed, hauled to the existing heap leaching facility, agglomerated and leached. The coarser reject material will be left at the present dump locations, but consolidated, regraded, and revegetated if possible. The original slopes exposed by removal of the waste dumps will be reclaimed.

The following reclaimed waste dump areas were visited during our inspection: Lower Mammoth, Gold Chain, and May Day. The Red Tailings and Borrow Pit areas were not visited as these have been inspected during previous site inspections and remain relatively unchanged. The Lower Mammoth and Gold Chain

Page 2
Site Inspection
North Lily Mining Co.
M/023/007
December 19, 1991

areas also exhibited little change since the Division's last inspection. Revegetation success will need to be assessed in the spring. Additional work will likely need to be performed on the lower portions of this area where the rejected, coarse, cobbly dump materials have been stockpiled. Discussions on the final disposition of this material are ongoing with the operator.

The May Day areas have been regraded, but portions remain to be reseeded. The regrading work looks good. The dozer-trenching on the contour is showing favorable success at inhibiting erosion, by retaining and concentrating available soil moisture in the trenches.

The Centennial/Eureka Dump area was also visited. This site is currently being screened and the fines processed. The Division noted some impact occurring to the undisturbed area immediately adjacent to the existing dump footprint. The operator has discovered that there is more coarse reject material in this dump than originally projected (@40% fines vs. estimated 60%). Consequently, they are having to return more material to the dump than anticipated. We indicated that the operator would need to update this extra impact in the plan.

Due to the physical and topographic constraints of this dump location, the extensive stockpile of screened reject material is spilling over onto a portion of unimpacted area. We expressed some concern over this activity with Mr. Spor and discussed possible alternate locations within the disturbed area which could be used to dispose of this excess material. Mr. Spor indicated that the screening of the dump was almost complete and there were no other alternatives which would prove more favorable. We informed Mr. Spor that the Division will require that the additional impacted area be reclaimed to appropriate reclamation standards and that all efforts be made to minimize additional disturbance to this area.

We informed Mr. Spor that we would finalize our review comments of his latest amendment proposal and respond as expeditiously as possible. We indicated that it is likely that the reclamation surety may require adjustment if the proposed disturbed area exceeds that which has been reclaimed to date.

jb
cc: Paul Spor, NLMC
Lowell Braxton, DOGM
M023007.1